



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m-f

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/075,000

02/13/2002

Hiroshi Yamamoto

SCEI 3.0-118

7154

530

7590

10/11/2006

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER

SKED, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/075,000	Applicant(s) YAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew J. Sked	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18 and 20-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18 and 20-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, necessitated by amendment.
2. Claims 20-30 have been newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guan et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,502,073), cited in the Office Action dated 1/19/06, in view of Hoory et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,785,649).

Guan teaches an information transmission method and system comprising:

in a network including a first information processing apparatus, a second information processing apparatus, and a server including an information distribution and administration apparatus other than the first and second process apparatuses, a first link connecting the first processing apparatus within the network, and a second link connecting the second information processing apparatus within the network, such that the communications between the first and second processing apparatuses are transmitted over at least the first and second links and are subject to administration by

the server (the system consists of two information processing devices connected through the Internet, wherein servers, communication links, etc. are inherent to the Internet, Fig. 1);

a first information processing process comprising the steps of capturing input speech information, changing the input speech information to character data; and under administration of the server, sending the character data by the first information processing apparatus to the network (receives speech and meaning-group recognizer converts it to textual form which is then coded and sent over the internet, col. 5, lines 35-44, col. 11, lines 9-16 and Fig. 1); and

a second information processing process comprising the steps of, under administration of the server, receiving character data from the network by the second information processing apparatus, generating second speech information from the received character data and using the second speech information to output speech (decoder decodes the coded packages and synthesizes the text, col. 6, lines 50-67).

Guan does not teach outputting the received character data.

Hoory teaches a system for information communication that decodes received text, synthesizes the text and outputs both the text and the speech (col. 5, lines 40-56 and col. 9, line 58 to col. 10, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Guan to output the received text as taught by Hoory because it would allow the user to visualize the communication information and more easily detect synthesis errors.

5. Claims 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,332,122), cited in the Office Action dated 1/19/06, in view of Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,421,453).

As per claims 21, 26, 27 and 29, Ortega teaches a method, apparatus, a computer-readable medium with a recorded and executed program and a computer containing a program for processing speech information of a speaker comprising:

accessing voiceprint information (database of characteristics of enrolled speakers, col. 4, lines 35-48);

comparing speech information obtained for an utterance of a speaker to the voice print information to identify a characteristic of the (if the speech frames have characteristics that match the enrolled speaker then assigns a speaker ID to the text, col. 4, lines 22-48);

generating a control command in dependence upon the characteristic of the speaker (sorts paragraphs and represents the text by particular colors or fonts based upon the speaker ID hence there must inherently be some control signal to perform these actions, col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 7);

converting the speech information to character data (transcribes the speech, col. 7, lines 22-34); and

subjecting the character data to predetermined processing in dependence upon the control command to form processed character data, such that the characteristic of the speaker is identifiable from the processed character data (sorts paragraphs and

Art Unit: 2626

represents the text by particular colors or fonts based upon the speaker ID, col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 7).

Ortega does not teach the characteristic being one or more of the speaker's gender, height, weight, age, occupation, hobbies or preferences.

Kanevsky teaches a system for user identification using biometric information including speech (col. 6, lines 30-56) wherein based upon the group associated with the identified user certain preferences are automatically invoked such as increasing the size of text (col. 31, line 48 to col. 32, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega so that the characteristic is a speaker preference as taught by Kanevsky because it would allow stored information corresponding to users influence the formatting of the output text, hence personalizing the system.

6. As per claims 22, 28 and 30, Ortega teaches outputting the processed character data, such that the characteristic of the speaker is identifiable from the outputted character data (outputs the data associated with the speaker in a different font or color, col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 7).

7. As per claim 23, Ortega teaches wherein the predetermined processing causes a character form of the processed data to vary from the character data (outputs the data associated with the speaker in a different font or color, col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 7).

Art Unit: 2626

8. Claims 24 and 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Kanevsky and taken in further view of Hoory.

Ortega and Kanevsky do not teach wherein the predetermined processing generates a control code for the processed character data and sending the processed character data to a network.

Hoory teaches a system for encoding formatted text and sending this data to a network (col. 5, lines 29-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega and Kanevsky to generate a control code for the processed character data and send the processed character data to a network as taught by Hoory because it would allow a user at a distant workstation to view the text.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2626


extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Sked whose telephone number is (571) 272-7627. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MS
10/05/06


DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600